

Summary of complaints and compliments
1 July 2025 – 30 September 2025

Complaints and Compliments received

	Total	Chief Executive	Deputy Chief Executive	Executive Director	Monitoring Officer	Leisure
Number of Stage One complaints	167	88	11	66	0	2
No. of complaints concluded under Stage Two	31	21	3	7	0	0
No. of complaints determined by the Ombudsman	5	5	0	0	0	0
Number of compliments received	74	63	0	11	0	0

Breakdown of complaints and compliments by department and section**Chief Executive's department**

Service Areas	Stage 1 Complaints	Stage 2 Complaints	Ombudsman Complaints	Compliments
Development Control	7	3	2	0
Housing and Income	9	1	0	7
Housing Repairs	32	5	3	12
Housing Operations	33	8	0	39
Housing Strategy	3	1	0	5
Environmental Health	4	3	0	0
Total	88	21	5	63

Deputy Chief Executive's Department

Service Areas	Stage 1 Complaints	Stage 2 Complaints	Ombudsman Complaints	Compliments
Customer Services	0	0	0	0
Capital Works	2	1	0	0
Revenues	9	2	0	0
Total	11	3	0	0

Executive Director's Department

Service Areas	Stage 1 Complaints	Stage 2 Complaints	Ombudsman Complaints	Compliments
Communications	0	0	0	3
Environment	4	0	0	0
Waste and Recycling	60	6	0	4
Bereavement	0	0	0	4
Information Governance	2	1	0	0
Total	66	7	0	11

Monitoring Officer's Department

Service Areas	Stage 1 Complaints	Stage 2 Complaints	Ombudsman Complaints	Compliments
Democratic Services	0	0	0	0
Total	0	0	0	0

Liberty Leisure Ltd

Service Area	Stage 1 Complaints	Stage 2 Complaints	Ombudsman Complaints	Compliments
Kimberley Leisure Centre	0	0	0	0
Bramcote Leisure Centre	2	0	0	0
Chilwell Leisure Centre	0	0	0	0
Total	2	0	0	0

STAGE 1 - FORMAL COMPLAINTS TO THE SERVICE DEPARTMENT**Time taken to acknowledge receipt of stage one complaints:**

	Total	Chief Executive	Deputy Chief Executive	Executive Director	Monitoring Officer	Liberty Leisure
Time taken to acknowledge complaints – 1 to 5 days	167	88	11	66	0	2
Time taken to acknowledge complaints - more than 5 days	0	0	0	0	0	0

Time taken to respond to stage one complaints:

	Total	Chief Executives	Deputy Chief Executive	Executive Director	Monitoring Officer	Liberty Leisure Ltd
Less than 10 working days	126	47	11	66	0	2
Over 10 working days	41	41	0	0	0	0

Directorate / Section	Chief Executive	
	Number responded to outside of 10 working days	Number of complaints where an extension was sought
Housing Income	2	2
Housing Operations	17	17
Housing Repairs	19	19
Housing Strategy	3	3
TOTAL	41	41

Stage 2 - Formal Complaints

32 formal complaints have been responded to in the first quarter; all of which were acknowledged within the 5 working day timescale, and 100% were responded to within the 20 working day timescale.

Time taken to respond to stage two complaints:

	Total	Chief Executives	Deputy Chief Executive	Executive Director	Monitoring Officer	Liberty Leisure Ltd
Less than 20 working days	31	21	3	7	0	0
Over 20 working days	0	0	0	0	0	0

Planning**1. Complaint against Planning**

Response – 20 working days

Complaint not upheld

Complaint

The complainant contacted the Council and complained that the Planning Team had not correctly enforced a Tennis Club's operating hours.

Council's response

It was determined that an appropriate level of service was provided as the Planning Team had correctly investigated the concerns raised about the tennis club and the increased running time.

As the tennis club does not have a restrictive condition on the length of the club activities there has been no breach in planning conditions. Therefore, the Council was unable to take any further action.

Assistant Director Comments

The Planning Team had correctly assessed the operating hours of the tennis club.

2. Complaint against Planning

Response – 20 working days

Complaint not upheld

Complaint

The complainant contacted the Council and complained that the Planning Team had incorrectly authorised a massage business under Class E.

Council's response

It was determined that an appropriate level of service was provided as the Planning Team had appropriately used Government Guidance in designating the massage business under Class E.

Class E allows for a premises to be changed from offering a professional service to one that offers medical or health services.

Assistant Director Comments

The Planning Team had correctly applied Government Guidance when designating the massage business.

3. Complaint against Planning

Response – 20 working days

Complaint not upheld

Complaint

The complainant contacted the Council and complained that the Planning Team had not correctly investigated a breach of their right of way to their property.

Council's response

It was determined that an appropriate level of service was provided as the Planning Team had appropriately investigated the alleged breach.

The works undertaken have occurred on private land and would not require planning permission. Therefore, no further action could be undertaken.

Assistant Director Comments

The Planning Team had correctly investigated the issued. This remains a civil dispute between two private land owners.

Housing Repairs

1. Complaint against Housing Repairs

Response – 20 working days

Complaint upheld

Complaint

The complainant contacted the Council and complained that an issue of damp and mould had not been rectified at their property.

Council's response

It was determined that an appropriate level of service was not provided as the Housing Repairs Team did not correctly schedule a damp survey with a specialist contractor in a timely manner.

While the Housing Repairs Team had inspected the property and the damp, by not booking a survey with the specialist damp contractor this further extended the period in which the complainant had reside in the property with a damp issue.

Furthermore, the Housing Repairs Team incorrectly booked a treatment for the damp that would not tackle the root cause of this problem.

The correct survey was booked and the works were undertaken to remove the damp and mould from the property.

An apology and £2,000 compensation was offered and accepted.

Assistant Director Comments

The Council recognises the inconvenience caused by not correctly booking the works to remove the damp and mould at the property.

Complaint Team Recommendations/actions

- The Housing Repairs Team has been reminded of their responsibility to effectively communicate with individuals.
- The Housing Repairs Team has been reminded of their responsibility to correctly identify and book works, especially where specialist contractor involvement is required, in a timely manner.
- The Housing Repairs Team has been reminded of the necessity to identify any damp issue before the commencement of an individual's tenancy.

2. Complaint against Housing Repairs

Response – 20 working days

Complaint upheld

Complaint

The complainant contacted the Council and complained that they were not notified of works to the communal lighting that caused them disruption.

Council's response

It was determined that an appropriate level of service was not provided as the Housing Repairs Team did not notify the complainant of the works to replace the communal lighting at the Whiteley Close flats.

The responsibility of informing residents of the need to replace this lighting was passed to the contractor. However, the Housing Repairs Team did not monitor this communication and subsequently the complainant was not informed of the works taking place.

An apology and £250 compensation was offered and accepted.

Assistant Director Comments

The Council recognises the inconvenience caused by not communicating with resident correctly.

Complaint Team Recommendations/actions

- The Housing Repairs Team have been reminded of their responsibility to notify Leaseholders as per the clauses set out in their leases.
- The Housing Repairs Team have been reminded of their responsibility to effectively communicate with Leaseholders where access and works are required.
- The Housing Repairs Team have been instructed to continue to review their communication methods in order to ensure that this service improves.

3. Complaint against Housing Repairs

Response – 20 working days

Withdrawn

Complaint

The complainant contacted the Council and complained that an issue of damp and mould had not been rectified at their property.

Council's response

This complaint was withdrawn during the course of the investigation.

4. Complaint against Housing Repairs

Response – 20 working days

Complaint not upheld

Complaint

The complainant contacted the Council and complained that an issue of a crack at the their property had not been correctly investigated.

Council's response

It was determined that an appropriate level of service was provided as the Housing Repairs Team had promptly investigated the issue of cracking at the complainant's home.

The Housing Repairs Team had attended the property and reviewed the cracks. These cracks were cross-referenced with the previous inspection and it was noted that they had not gotten any worse.

Assistant Director Comments

The correct actions were undertaken to review the cracks. The property remains structurally sound and no further action is required.

5. Complaint against Housing Repairs

Response – 20 working days

Complaint not upheld

Complaint

The complainant contacted the Council and complained that their property was in a state of disrepair when let.

Council's response

The Housing Repairs Team had completed all major works and cleaning of the property before it was let.

The Council's records show that the cleaning was completed to a satisfactory standard.

Furthermore, additional works identified during the viewing of the property were completed in a timely manner following the signing of the tenancy. The Council's records indicate that the complainant agreed that these works would be completed once they had signed the tenancy and moved into the property. The works were subsequently completed in a timely manner following the signing of the tenancy.

Assistant Director Comments

The Housing Repairs Team had appropriately undertaken the cleaning and repairs to the property before it was let.

Housing Operations

1. Complaint against Housing Operations

Response – 20 working days

Complaint not upheld

Complaint

The complainant contacted the Council and complained that the Council had not dealt with an issue of Anti-Social Behaviour.

Council's response

It was determined that an appropriate level of service was provided as the Tenancy Services Team are unable to act upon instances of Anti-Social Behaviour (ASB) without the necessary evidence.

In this instance, as the complainant had not provided any evidence to substantiate the alleged ASB they were experiencing, the Tenancy Services Team were unable to undertake any action.

Assistant Director Comments

The Council had acted appropriately and inline with Policies to investigate the Anti-Social Behaviour reports.

2. Complaint against Housing Operations

Response – 20 working days

Complaint not upheld

Complaint

The complainant contacted the Council and complained that the Council had inappropriately registered their housing needs as requiring one bedroom.

Council's response

It was determined that an appropriate level of service was provided as the Housing Allocations Team have determined the application in line with the information the complainant had submitted.

The information the complainant had submitted did not support that a two-bed property was required.

Assistant Director Comments

The Council had acted appropriately and inline with the Allocations Policy.

3. Complaint against Housing Operations

Response – 20 working days

Complaint not upheld

Complaint

The complainant contacted the Council and complained that the Council had not dealt with an issue of Anti-Social Behaviour and the removal of a fence.

Council's response

It was determined that an appropriate level of service was provided as the Tenancy Services Team had acted appropriately in removing the fence and returning it to its original position.

The Council recognises that this was undertaken due to the complainant's safety concerns. However, as this was undertaken without permission and was causing access issues for other residents, this could not be allowed to remain in the new position.

The Council's records indicate that the reports of Anti-Social Behaviour had been investigated promptly.

Assistant Director Comments

The Council had acted appropriately and inline with Policies to investigate the Anti-Social Behaviour reports.

4. Complaint against Housing Operations

Response – 20 working days

Complaint not upheld

Complaint

The complainant contacted the Council and complained that the Council had inappropriately entered their temporary accommodation property to check on their wellbeing.

Council's response

It was determined that an appropriate level of service was provided as the Temporary Accommodation Team acted upon reports of the complainant's property being unsecure and the fire alarm sounding in a prompt manner.

The Temporary Accommodation Team undertook this action due to genuine concerns for the complainant's safety and acted appropriately to ensure they and their child were safe.

Assistant Director Comments

The Council had acted appropriately on safeguarding concerns to ensure that the resident and their family was safe.

5. Complaint against Housing Operations

Response – 20 working days

Complaint upheld

Complaint

The complainant contacted the Council and complained that the Council had recorded inappropriate comments about them.

Council's response

It was determined that an appropriate level of service was not provided as the Housing Options Team inappropriately included an opinion based record on to the complainant's housing file which stated that they were a racist.

These entries onto housing application should not have taken place as there is no evidence to suggest that this record required entry.

The record has now been deleted from the housing application.

However, due to the language used in the complainant's complaints of Anti-Social Behaviour (ASB) there was sufficient concern from the Housing Department to make a note of their submissions.

An apology was offered to the complainant.

Assistant Director Comments

It is recognised that the opinion based evidence should not be placed on to individual's housing files if these cannot be substantiated.

6. Complaint against Housing Operations

Response – 20 working days

Complaint not upheld

Complaint

The complainant contacted the Council and complained that the banding decision from their Housing Application has been made incorrectly.

Council's response

The information submitted by the complainant does not support that a two-bed property is required. They are currently appropriately banded.

Assistant Director Comments

The Housing Allocations Team had appropriately banded the complainant in line with the Allocations Policy.

7. Complaint against Housing Operations

Response – 20 working days

Complaint not upheld

Complaint

The complainant contacted the Council and complained that their tenancy as ended despite no termination form, valid notice or key return.

Council's response

The Tenancy Service attempted to make contact with the complainant on multiple occasions to determine if they are still residing at the property. As no contact had been made by complainant, over several months, it was determined that they were no longer living at the property.

The Tenancy Services Team served the correct Notices against the complainant to notify of them of the intention to terminate their tenancy and dispose for the remaining items at the property should they not confirm their residence.

Assistant Director Comments

The Housing Allocations Team appropriately contacted the tenant to determine their tenancy. As no confirmation had been received and the property was empty, the tenancy was terminated.

8. Complaint against Housing Operations

Response – 20 working days

Complaint not upheld

Complaint

The complainant contacted the Council and complained that the Housing Allocations Team has refused to award them a band 1 priority on the Housing Register twice.

Council's response

The Housing Options Team have determined that the complainant was not in priority need for housing and have subsequently discharged its homelessness duty.

Assistant Director Comments

The Housing Allocations Team had appropriately banded the complainant in line with the Allocations Policy.

Housing Strategy

1. Complaint against Housing Strategy

Response – 20 working days

Complaint not upheld

Complaint

The complainant contacted the Council and complained that they had been issued a warning for installing a fence at their Leasehold Property despite having planning permission.

Council's response

It was determined that an appropriate level of service was provided as the Housing Strategy Team had appropriately enforced the conditions of the Lease.

The alterations the complainant had made to the property were not permitted as per the terms of the Lease.

Assistant Director Comments

The correct actions were undertaken to enforce the terms of the Lease. While planning permission may have been granted, the Council remain the owner of the land and permission has not been granted to alter the property.

Housing Income

1. Complaint against Housing Income

Response – 20 working days

Complaint upheld

Complaint

The complainant contacted the Council and complained that they had not received a response to their enquiry over a bedroom size. Furthermore, they believed the bedroom was too small to qualify for the spare room subsidy they were paying.

Council's response

It was determined that an appropriate level of service was not provided as the outcome of the review of the spare bedroom was not provided in an appropriate amount of time.

The full response was subsequently provided as part of the stage 1 complaint response.

The spare bedroom meets the minimum required standard as set by the Houses in Multiple Occupation guidance.

While the complainant lives in a Council property, these standards are applied to the Council's housing stock.

As the spare bedroom exceeds the standard bedroom size as set out by the Houses in Multiple Occupation guidance it is considered that this room is acceptable and is not exempt from spare room subsidy.

An apology was offered for the delayed communication.

Assistant Director Comments

The Council recognises the inconvenience of not providing the response to the enquiry in a timely manner.

Environmental Health

1. Complaint against Environmental Health

Response – 20 working days

Complaint not upheld

Complaint

The complainant contacted the Council and complained that the Licensing Team inappropriately granted a license to a massage business.

Council's response

It was determined that an appropriate level of service was provided as the Licensing Team had appropriately considered the application for the massage and special treatment business.

No objections were raised by Nottinghamshire Police and as part of this process the Environmental Health Team considered the application and had no objections.

Due to this, there was no justification for the license to be refused.

Assistant Director Comments

The correct actions were undertaken to review the license. There was no evidence to suggest that the license should be refused.

2. Complaint against Environmental Health

Response – 20 working days

Complaint not upheld

Complaint

The complainant contacted the Council and complained that the Environmental Health Team have not dealt with an issue of rubbish accumulation in a neighbouring garden.

Council's response

It was determined that an appropriate level of service was provided as the Environmental Health Team have appropriately investigated the issues raised regarding the neighbour's garden.

The Environmental Health Team had undertaken the appropriate visits in a timely manner and had issued the correct warnings and notices following the investigation of the garden.

Assistant Director Comments

The correct actions had been taken to investigate the issue raised. These were undertaken promptly and Notices were issued to ensure that the garden is tidied.

3. Complaint against Environmental Health

Response – 20 working days

Complaint upheld

Complaint

The complainant contacted the Council and complained that the Licensing Team had extended a pubs closing time.

Council's response

It was determined that an appropriate level of service was not provided as the Licensing Team had not provided responses to the complainant's enquiries.

Repetitious or similar issues that had been raised were not responded to.

The Licensing Team had not increased the Pubs closing times to 1am. This closing time had been established since 2005 and a minor amendment has been agreed by the Environmental Health Team to limit the length of time the garden can be used by patrons.

An apology was offered for the poor communication.

Assistant Director Comments

While the correct actions had been taken to investigate the issue raised, it is recognised that the communication had been poor.

Capital Works

1. Complaint against Capital Works

Response – 20 working days

Complaint not upheld

Complaint

The complainant contacted the Council and complained that the Capital Works have refused to install a fence at their property to protect their privacy and their new build property had been built incorrectly.

Council's response

It was determined that an appropriate level of service was provided as the Council and its contractors have correctly built the property in accordance with the approved plans. The Council was unable to erect a fence around the property as this would interfere with the public highway, the communal access to the properties and would sit flush with the windows.

Furthermore, a fence can only be installed up to 1m on a public highway. Any fence higher than 1m would require planning permission.

There was no information to suggest that the Council had acted inappropriately when constructing the property or in contravention of the Housing Ombudsman Guidance and Housing Act 1996.

Assistant Director Comments

The property has been constructed in accordance with the approved plans and remains a safe place to reside.

Revenues, Benefits and Customer Services

1. Complaint against Council Tax

Response – 20 working days

Complaint not upheld

Complaint

The complainant contacted the Council and complained that the Council Tax Team did not appropriately update a forwarding address which resulted in enforcement action being undertaken.

Council's response

It was determined that an appropriate level of service was provided as the Council Tax Team had correctly issued the Council Tax bills to the address that had been provided.

As notification had not been received of the need to change the forwarding address, the bills continued to be sent to the last known address.

Assistant Director Comments

The Council Tax acted appropriately by continuing to send the Council Tax bills to the last known address.

2. Complaint against Benefits

Response – 20 working days

Complaint not upheld

Complaint

The complainant contacted the Council and complained that the Benefits Team had failed to undertake their duties in relation to sections 1, 2, 9, 18 and 42-44 of the Care Act 2014 and has failed to make reasonable adjustments under the Equality Act 2010.

Council's response

It was determined that an appropriate level of service was provided as the Benefits Team had correctly provided the complainant with assistance when making a benefit claim.

There was no evidence information to suggest that the Benefit Team had acted inappropriately toward the complainant or acted outside of the scope of the Care Act and Equality and Diversity Act.

Assistant Director Comments

There is no evidence to suggest the complainant had been treated poorly during their benefit claim.

Environment

1. Complaint against Environment

Response – 20 working days

Withdrawn

Complaint

The complainant contacted the Council and complained that grass cutting had taken place on their property that they did not request.

Council's response

This complaint was withdrawn during the course of the investigation.

Assistant Director Comments

N/A

2. Complaint against Environment

Response – 20 working days

Complaint upheld

Complaint

The complainant contacted the Council and complained that the Waste Team had failed to collect their garden waste bin on the correct day.

Council's response

It was determined that an appropriate level of service was not provided as the garden waste bin had not been collected correctly.

While the Council had attempted to collect the bin, access issues have prevented this from occurring.

Assistant Director Comments

The Council recognises the inconvenience of not collecting the bin on the designated day.

3. Complaint against Environment

Response – 20 working days

Complaint upheld

Complaint

The complainant contacted the Council and complained that the Waste Team had failed to collect their waste bin on the correct day.

Council's response

It was determined that an appropriate level of service was not provided as the garden waste bin had not been collected on the correct day.

This was a service error and the bin was collected following its reporting.

Assistant Director Comments

The Council recognises the inconvenience of not collecting the bin on the designated day.

4. Complaint against Environment

Response – 20 working days

Complaint not upheld

Complaint

The complainant contacted the Council and complained that they had been inappropriately given a littering fine.

Council's response

It was determined that an appropriate level of service was provided as the WISE Team were correct in issuing the Fixed Penalty Notice as they had observed the complainant incorrectly disposing of a cigarette.

The body camera footage showed the complainant incorrectly disposing of the cigarette.

Assistant Director Comments

The Council issued the fine correctly as there was clear evidence of littering having occurred.

5. Complaint against Environment

Response – 20 working days

Complaint upheld

Complaint

The complainant contacted the Council and complained that the Waste Team had failed to collect their waste bin on the correct day.

Council's response

It was determined that an appropriate level of service was not provided as the garden waste bin had not been collected on the correct day.

This was a service error and the bin was collected following its reporting.

Assistant Director Comments

The Council recognises the inconvenience of not collecting the bin on the designated day.

6. Complaint against Environment

Response – 20 working days

Complaint upheld

Complaint

The complainant contacted the Council and complained that the Waste Team had failed to collect their waste bin on the correct day.

Council's response

It was determined that an appropriate level of service was not provided as the waste bin had not been collected on the correct day.

This was a service error and the bin was collected following its reporting.

Assistant Director Comments

The Council recognises the inconvenience of not collecting the bin on the designated day.

Appendix 3

**STAGE 3 – COMPLAINTS TO THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT OMBUDSMAN (LGO)
/HOUSING OMBUDSMAN (HO)**

Stage 3 - Ombudsman Complaint

1. Complaint against Housing Repairs (complaint concluded in 2023/24)

Complaint Upheld.

Complaint

The concern raised was that the Council did not repair a leaking ceiling in a timely manner.

Ombudsman's conclusion

The HO found that in accordance with paragraph 53(b) of the Housing Ombudsman Scheme, the Council had made an offer of redress prior to investigation which, in the Ombudsman's opinion, satisfactorily resolves the complaint about its handling of a roof leak at the resident's property.

There was a lack of attention to detail in the stage 1 response as the wrong block number was referred to and the Council addressed some unrelated issues that had been mentioned in the December 2015 email that had already been resolved some time ago.

Given it accepted some failings it would have been appropriate for the Council to have offered compensation in its stage 1 response. It is noted however that this was remedied in the Council's stage 2 response where it made an appropriate offer of compensation in line with the remedies guidance for the delays in resolving the roof leak.

The Council was ordered to pay £300 for the handling of the stage 1 complaint. This has been completed.

2. Complaint against Housing Repairs (complaint concluded in 2024/25)

Complaint Upheld.

Complaint

The concern raised was that the Council did not handle a boiler repair appropriately.

Ombudsman's conclusion

The HO found that In accordance with paragraph 53(b) of the Housing Ombudsman Scheme, the Council provided reasonable redress in response to the resident's complaint about its handling of boiler repairs. A payment of £250 compensation was issued at stage 2 of the Council's complaint process.

The resident raised concerns about whether the Council considered her mother's vulnerabilities when it responded to the boiler issues. The HO would expect the Council to consider a resident's needs and vulnerabilities when responding to a boiler not working. The Council attended a day earlier than was required and this indicates that the Council had given the repair an additional priority but did not communicate this clearly to the resident.

The Council acknowledged there were failures in how it responded to the boiler issues and these include:

- The out of hours phone line did not work on the Easter bank holiday Friday.
- Its contractor did not bring overshoes to appointments.
- There was poor communication about when the contractor would be coming for follow up appointments.
- Its contractor did not initially identify why the new boiler was not working.

Overall, the HO were satisfied that the acknowledgement of its failures, apology, and compensation provided by the Council represents reasonable redress for the failures in respect to its handling of the boiler repairs. The compensation that it had paid is in line with what the HO may have awarded for this type of issue and, in their opinion, is proportionate to the impact to the residents.

3. Complaint against Housing Repairs (complaint concluded in 2024/25)

Complaint Upheld.

Complaint

The concern raised was that the Council did not handle a report of a blocked drain.

Ombudsman's conclusion

The HO found that in accordance with paragraph 52 of the Scheme, there was maladministration in the landlord's handling of the repair of blocked drain.

Despite the multiple reports of the same issue and different contractors attending the property, the issue was not resolved to the resident's satisfaction.

It is reasonable for Council to rely on independent and professional contractor's advice. However, as this issue was repeatedly reported and there was a clear dispute on what was causing the blockage, the Council should have considered at an earlier stage an alternative approach or done more to investigate the resident's concerns.

This is particularly important as the resident reported significant inconvenience that they were unable to use their shower for months and the inconvenience caused by the multiple visits. Despite a contractor recommending cameras should be used, this was not done. It would have been appropriate to follow the expert advice. Its failure to consider an escalated response was therefore unreasonable in the circumstances.

The Council was ordered to pay £300 for the handling of the reports of the blocked drain. This has been completed.

4. Complaint against Planning (complaint concluded in 2024/25)

Complaint not Upheld.

Complaint

The concern raised was that the Council did not consider a planning application correctly.

Ombudsman's conclusion

The LGO would not investigate this complaint about how the Council dealt with a planning application. This is because they were unlikely to find fault.

In this case, the LGO were satisfied the Council properly assessed the acceptability of the development, including the impact on the complainant's, the character of the area and the impact on highway visibility, before granting planning permission. The case officer's report referred to the objections received and explains why the Planning Officer considers the proposal overcomes these.

5. Complaint against Planning (complaint concluded in 2024/25)

Complaint not Upheld.

Complaint

The concern raised was that the Council did not consider a planning application correctly.

Ombudsman's conclusion

The LGO would not investigate the complainant's complaint because they have the right to appeal to the Planning Inspector.

The complainant has complained about how the Council dealt with his planning application.

They disagreed with how the Council reached its decision to request additional information to support the application and believes it has been dishonest. The complainant says the Council has misinterpreted planning policies and it has approved similar applications in the area.

However, the complainant can choose not to provide the information requested if they does not agree with the Council's reasons for requesting it.

The complainant would have the right to appeal to the Planning Inspector if the Council subsequently decides to refuse permission for the development. The LGO consider it would be reasonable for the complainant to use their right to appeal.

The Ombudsman will not usually investigate when someone has a right to appeal to the Planning Inspector, even if the appeal would not address all the issues complained about.